

Appln. No. 10/689,309  
Comments dated Jun. 23, 2005

### REMARKS

To the extent that the Examiner's statement suggests or states that certain limitations not found in the prior art are present in each and every claim (whether or not specific language to that effect is actually found in every claim), Applicants note that the record as a whole, namely, the actual claim language, supplements the Examiner's statement. More specifically, for example, the Examiner implies that the use of a Synchronization Markup Language (SyncML) distinguishes the claimed invention over the Craig et al. reference (United States Patent No. 6,266,809). Applicants agree but submit that the claims as a whole distinguish over the prior art and reserve the right to argue other novel elements, features or combinations if the need arise in the future.

In addition, Applicants believe that the Examiner's statement may imply that the dependent claims are also allowable for only the reasons set forth. However, the Examiner's reasons do not discuss any of the other elements of the claimed subject matter, in particular those additional elements recited by dependent claims 2-14 and 16-25, all of which Applicants believe are also not found in the prior art and render the dependent claims independently allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants interpret the Examiner's statement to be a statement of only one reason for allowance of the claims, and that other reasons also exist for allowance of the claims such as, for example, those set forth more completely in the record as a whole. This interpretation is consistent with MPEP 1302.14, which states that any statement of reasons for allowance "[i]s not intended to necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details why claims are allowed and should not be written to specifically or impliedly state all the reasons for allowance are set forth."

Appln. No. 10/689,309  
Comments dated Jun. 23, 2005

If the Examiner disagrees with Applicants' interpretation, Applicants respectfully request that, prior to issuance, the Examiner withdraw the existing statement of reasons for allowance and simply rely on the record as a whole or clarify the existing statement of reasons for allowance.


Finally, the Examiner has characterized numerous prior art references in his statement regarding allowable subject matter. Applicants agree with the Examiner that claims 1-26 are allowable in view of all of the references made of record, either alone or in combination. However, Applicants do not agree nor disagree with the Examiner's characterization of those references and reserve the right to argue its own characterization should that need arise in the future.

If the Examiner has any questions, or if Applicants can be of assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: June 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kevin E. Borg  
Reg. No. 51,486  
Agent for applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 W. Madison St., 34th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60661-2565  
Telephone: (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100